

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 20-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Telephone Interview Summary

Examiner Nicholas R. Taylor and Applicants' representative Scott Thorpe held a telephone interview on October 27, 2010. We discussed proposed amendments to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections and agreed that the amendments would overcome the rejections.

Response to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-9 and 20-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claim 1 with the limitations “...a storage device storing executable code...” and “...a processor executing the executable code, the executable code comprising...” The amendment is well supported by the specification on page 7, ¶¶ 26-27. Claims 24 and 30 are similarly amended.

Claim 20 is amended with the limitation “...by use of a processor...” The amendment is well supported by the specification on page 7, ¶ 26. Claim 23 is similarly amended. Applicants submit that because of the amendments claims 1-9 and 20-35 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the presented remarks and amendments, Applicants assert that the application is in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 10, 2010

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527

Kunzler & McKenzie
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 994-4646 voice
(801) 531-1929 fax